### REMARKS

#### I. Basis for Amendment

This Amendment is filed after a final rejection pursuant to 37 C.F.R. § 1.116(b)(1). Therefore, Applicant requests entry of the Amendment.

# II. Claim Status

Claims 1-19 were previously pending. Upon entry of the present amendment, claims 1-14 and 18 will be pending, with claims 1 and 9 being independent claims. Previously pending claims 1-15, 18 and 19 were rejected, and claims 16 and 17 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. Applicant respectfully submits that the amendments presented herein place the Subject Application in condition for allowance.

### III. Objection to the Specification

In the pending Office Action, the amendment to the specification filed 8 July 2008 was objected to under 35 U.S.C. §132(a) because it allegedly introduces new matter into the disclosure. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, in order to place the Subject Application into condition for allowance, Applicant has herein canceled (without prejudice or disclaimer) the amendment to the specification filed 8 July 2008. Therefore, the alleged new matter is no longer present in the specification of the Subject Application.

Applicant does not acquiesce or otherwise concede the correctness of the objection to the amendment to the specification filed 8 July 2008. Applicant respectfully submits that the subject matter inserted in the Subject Application by way of the amendment to the specification filed 8 July 2008 was previously and properly incorporated by reference into the Subject Application as originally-filed in compliance with 37 C.F.R. § 1.57. Thus, the

amendment contained no new matter. Therefore, Applicant reserves the right to present the subject matter in related applications that may be filed at a later date.

# IV. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph

In the pending Office Action, claims 1, 9 and 15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph, as allegedly failing to comply with the written description requirement. The Office asserts that the previous claims contained new matter not disclosed in the Subject Application as originally filed. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, in order to place the Subject Application into condition for allowance, Applicant has herein canceled (without prejudice or disclaimer) the alleged new matter. Therefore, the alleged new matter is no longer present in the claims of Subject Application.

# V. Claim Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §§ 102(e) and 103(a)

In the pending Office Action, claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,632,347 to Buckley et al. ("Buckley"). In addition, the Office rejected claims 1-15 and 18-19 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over Buckley alone or in combination with various other references. Applicant respectfully disagrees. Nevertheless, Applicant has herein amended the claims to place the Subject Application into condition for allowance.

In the pending Office Action, claims 16-17 stand objected to as begin dependent upon a rejected base claim, but otherwise allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claim. Claim 16 depends from independent claim 1, and claim 17 depends from independent claim 9. Claims 1 and 9 are amended herein to incorporate the features recited in claims 16 and 17, respectively, which are canceled. Claims 15 and 19 are also canceled. In effect, claims 16 and 17 have been rewritten herein in independent form including all of the limitations of the respective base claims 1 and 9. Claims 1 and 9 are therefore allowable. Claims 2-8, 10-14 and 18 are also allowable at least because they depend directly or indirectly from either claim 1 or 9.

Form PTO-1449 U.S. Department of Commerce (Rev. 8-88) Patent and Trademark Office  INFORMATION DISCLOSURE CITATION (Use several sheets if necessary)				Attorney Docket No.: 1201.68199		Serial No.: 10/659,066			
				Applicant: Calder et al.					
				Filing Date: September 9, 200	Group: 2191				
U.S. PATE	NT DOCUMENTS								
Examiner Initial*	Document Number	Date	Name		Class	Subclass	Filing Date If Appropriate		
			<u> </u>		_				
•									
,							<u> </u>		
	-	_							
FOREIGN	ATENT DOCUMENTS					<u></u>			
TOKEIGIV	ATENT DOCOMENTS						Translation		
	Document Number	Date	Country		Class	Subclass	Yes No		
	Document (vamoe)	Date	Country		Class	Subciass	103		
ij			V.						
OTHER DO	CUMENTS (Including Aut	nor Title Date	Pertinent Page	s Ftc )	1	<u> </u>	<u> </u>		
OTHER DOCUMENTS (Including Author, Title, Date, Pertinent Pages, Etc.)  Merten, M.C., Trick, A.R., George, C.N., Gyllenhaal, J.C., Hwu, W.W., "A Hardware-Driven Profiling Scheme									
M 1	for Identifying Hot Spots to Support Runtime Optimization," 26 <sup>th</sup> International Symposium on Computer Architecture, pp. 136-147, May 1999.								
1 1	Sherwood, T., Calder, T., "Time Varying Behavior of Programs," UCSD Technical Report, CS99-630, August								
my	1999, pp. 1-16. http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/~calder/papers/UCSD-CS99-630.pdf								
ms.	Sherwood, T., Perelman, E., Calder, B., "Basic Block Distribution Analysis to Find Periodic Behavior and Simulation Points in Applications," Proceedings of the International Conference on Parallel Architectures and Compilation Techniques (PACT 2001), Sept. 2001, Barcelona, Spain. http://www-cse.ucsd.edu/-calder/papers/PACT-01-BBDA.pdf								
	Sherwood, T., Perelman, E., Hamerly, G., Calder, B., "Automatically Characterizing Large Scale Program								
MI	Behavior," Proceedings of the 10 <sup>th</sup> International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (ASPLOS 2002), October 2002, San Jose, California. http://www-								
cse.ucsd.edu/-calder/papers/ASPLOS-02-SimPoint.pdf  Wunderlich P. Wenisch T. Folgef, P. Hoo I. "Smorte: Accelerating Micrographitecture Simulation									
Rigorous Statistical Sampling," In 30th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture, June 2003.									
Examiner	M. Steetman		Date	e Considered 7.18	2006				
*Examiner: Initial if citation considered, whether or not citation is in conformance with MPEP 609; Draw line through citation if not in conformance and not considered. Include copy of this form with next communication to applicant.									